



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,221	01/18/2002	Kazuya Kishimoto	P6545a	7176

20178 7590 08/24/2005

EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT
150 RIVER OAKS PARKWAY, SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/051,221

Applicant(s)

KISHIMOTO, KAZUYA

Examiner

Backhean Tiv

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/31/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2151

Detailed Action

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. This is a response to the amendment filed on 5/31/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As per claims 1-11, recite the feature, "second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system", this feature is not enabled by the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-8,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Patent 5,706,452 issued to Ivanov.

As per claim 1,6,7,10,11, Yamamoto teaches a work-flow cooperation processing apparatus that achieves cooperation among at least two work-flow systems, comprising:

a first work-flow systems including a first computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Figs. 5);

an electronic-mail storage that stores an electronic mail sent from the first work-flow system(Fig.5),

a second work-flow system including a second computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

a method-server apparatus that reads the electronic mail from the electronic mail storage and determines whether the electronic mail relates to the second work-flow system(Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

Yamamoto, does not explicitly teach the electronic mail including a command; wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system.

Ivanov teaches the electronic mail including a command(Abstract, Figs.1-10);wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system(Figs.1-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Yamamoto to add a command in an email to be performed by another computer in another work flow system as taught by Frantz in order to remotely monitor and control systems.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamamoto and Ivanov in order to provide a system for controlling and monitoring remote systems.

As per claim 2,8, wherein the first computer apparatus sends the electronic mail for storage in the electronic-mail storage when electronic-mail processing is designated at a node of a work flow in the first work-flow system; and the first computer apparatus does not send the electronic mail when electronic mail processing is not designated at the node of the work flow in the first work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 53-65; it is inherent that if an email is not addressed to a specific person that it will not send the email).

As per claim 4, wherein the command is an activation command that activates the work flow in the second work-flow system (Yomamoto, Fig.5, col.5, lines 64-67).

As per claim 5, wherein the electronic mail has text data, and the text data includes a parameter specifying the work flow in the second work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 1-22).

Claims 3,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Patent 5,706,452 issued to Ivanov in further view of Office Notice.

Yamamoto in view of Ivanov teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and 7, and further teaches as per claim 3,9 wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the electronic mail is related to the work flow in the second work-flow system(col.6, lines 1-15;the 1st system determines that the email is related to the second work flow system).

Yamamoto in view of Ivanov however, does not teach deleting email from a mail storage. Office Notice is taken; one ordinary skill in the art would delete an email from a mail storage when the email is read or unwanted to save memory or storage space.

One ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Yamamoto in view of Ivanov and to delete email from a mail storage to provide a system to save storage space on a computer.

Claims 1-2,4-8,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Patent 6,003,070 issued to Frantz.

As per claim 1,6,7,10,11, Yamamoto teaches a work-flow cooperation processing apparatus that achieves cooperation among at least two work-flow systems, comprising:

a first work-flow systems including a first computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Figs. 5);

an electronic-mail storage that stores an electronic mail sent from the first work-flow system(Fig.5),

a second work-flow system including a second computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

a method-server apparatus that reads the electronic mail from the electronic mail storage and determines whether the electronic mail relates to the second work-flow system(Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

Yamamoto, does not explicitly teach the electronic mail including a command; wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system.

Franz teaches the electronic mail including a command(Abstract, col.4, lines 43-50);wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system(col.4, lines 43-col.5,line 67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Yamamoto to add a command in an email to be

Art Unit: 2151

performed by another computer in another work flow system as taught by Frantz in order to remotely monitor and control systems (Frantz, col.2, lines 1-10).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamamoto and Franz in order to provide a system for controlling and monitoring remote systems.

As per claim 2,8, wherein the first computer apparatus sends the electronic mail for storage in the electronic-mail storage when electronic-mail processing is designated at a node of a work flow in the first work-flow system, and the first computer apparatus does not send the electronic mail when electronic mail processing is not designated at the node of the work flow in the first work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 53-65; it is inherent that if an email is not addressed to a specific person that it will not send the email).

As per claim 4, wherein the command is an activation command that activates the work flow in the second work-flow system (Yomamoto, Fig.5, col.5, lines 64-67).

As per claim 5, wherein the electronic mail has text data, and the text data includes a parameter specifying the work flow in the second work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 1-22).

Claims 3,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Patent 6,003,070 issued to Frantz in further view of Office Notice.

Yamamoto in view of Frantz teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and 7, and further teaches as per claim 3,9 wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the electronic mail is related to the work flow in the second work-flow system(col.6, lines 1-15;the 1st system determines that the email is related to the second work flow system).

Yamamoto in view of Frantz however, does not teach deleting email from a mail storage. Office Notice is taken; one ordinary skill in the art would delete an email from a mail storage when the email is read or unwanted to save memory or storage space.

One ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Yamamoto in view of Frantz and to delete email from a mail storage to provide a system to save storage space on a computer.

Response to Arguments

All 112 2nd paragraph rejections are withdrawn due to applicant's amendments.

Applicant's arguments filed 5/31/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues, as per claim 1-11, that Yamamoto in view of Frantz does not teach, " the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system". Frantz, col.4, lines 43-col.5, lines 67, teaches an email being sent to a technician and the in the email are instructions to either repair or upgrade the system, which clearly teaches "the command to the second computer apparatus when the

Art Unit: 2151

command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system”.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2151

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

BT
Backhean Tiv
2151
8/19/05


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER